



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/467,503	12/20/1999	GREGORY MAURICE PLOW	ST999007/128	2479

7590

09/24/2002

JOSEPH A SAWYER JR
SAWYER & ASSOCIATES
P O BOX 51418
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/467,503

Applicant(s)

PLOW ET AL.

Examiner

Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 10, 20, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 10, 20 and 30, which is dependent on claim 1, 11, and 21 respectively, the term "minimize all button" is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "minimize all button" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Because of this rejection, claims 10, 20 and 30 have not been considered over the prior art.

As per claims 31 and 32, the term "a portion of the at least one application window" in lines 8 and 15 should be changed to --the portion of the at least one application window--

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who

Art Unit: 2174

has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-29, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jaaskelainen, Jr. (US #6,002,397).

As per independent claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches a method for displaying hidden information on a display screen, the display screen displaying a plurality of application windows, a first window of the plurality of application windows obscuring the hidden information within a second window of the plurality of application windows (fig. 2A; from col. 4, lines 64-67 through col. 5, lines 1-12), comprising the steps of:

creating a viewport as a topmost window in response to a first user interaction (*window hatch 110*; fig. 2B; col. 5, lines 12-27 and lines 35-41);

associating the second application window with the viewport in response to a second user interaction; displaying the hidden information in the viewport whenever the viewport is positioned over the hidden information (fig. 2B; col. 5, lines 26-35).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches a third application window obscures the hidden information within the second window (fig. 2A; from col. 4, lines 64-67 through col. 5, lines 1-12).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches displaying the hidden information in the viewport includes displaying a portion of the hidden information (fig. 2B; col. 5, lines 26-35).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches creating a viewport as a topmost window in response to a first user interaction includes providing an application viewport tool (col. 5, lines 50-55 and col. 6, lines 6-13).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of:

relocating the viewport wherein a first portion of the display occupied by the viewport and displaying the hidden information is restored to a normal display of the first application window upon moving the viewport to a second portion of the display that is not contiguous with the first portion (col. 5, lines 51-55); it is inherent in Jaaskelainen's system that when the window hatch is repositioned to the second portion of the display that is not contiguous with the first portion, the display (in the first portion) occupied by the window hatch and displaying the hidden information is restored to a normal display of the first application window.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising the step of.

capturing the hidden information displayed within the viewport wherein the hidden information displayed within the viewport becomes invariant in response to a user interaction (col. 12, lines 35-41).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 6, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches the method of claim 6 further comprising the steps of.

Art Unit: 2174

relocating the viewport from a first portion of the display to a second portion of the display; continuing to display the invariant hidden information within the viewport (col. 12, lines 35-41).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches the viewport can be resized (col. 10, lines 26-33).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Jaaskelainen, Jr. teaches the viewport includes a plurality of viewports (fig. 2E; col. 6, lines 22-27).

As per independent claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 1; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 11, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 1; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 2; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 4; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 5; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 6; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 26, it is a similar scope to claim 7; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 28, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 8; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 29, which is dependent on claim 21, it is a similar scope to claim 9; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 31, it is a similar scope to claim 1 and 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

As per independent claim 32, it is a similar scope to claim 1 and 3; therefore, it should be rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Pat. No. 5689666 to Berquist, David T. et al. discloses method for handling obscured items on computer displays.

US Pat. No. 5651107 to Frank, Edward H. et al. discloses method and apparatus for presenting information in a display system using transparent windows.

US Pat. No. 5896131 to Alexander, Jay A discloses video raster display with foreground windows that are partially transparent or translucent.

US Pat. No. RE37722 to Burnard, David J. et al. discloses object-oriented system for the transparent translation among locales of locale-dependent application programs.

US Pat. No. 5956030 to Conrad, Thomas J. et al. discloses computer system with graphical user interface including windows having an identifier within a control region on the display.

US Pat. No. 6163318 to Fukuda, Ryoji et al. discloses window displaying system with displaying of set of window graphs showing overlapping state of windows

Art Unit: 2174

Inquires

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kistine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Nhon (Gary) D. Nguyen
September 17, 2002

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100